



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CW.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,703	02/25/2002	Roberto Furia	8240-11	5318

7590 02/12/2003

Woodard, Emhardt, Naughton,
Moriarty and McNett
Bank One Center/Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137

EXAMINER

PATEL, MAULIN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3737

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,703

Applicant(s)

FURIA, ROBERTO

Examiner

Maulin Patel

Art Unit

3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,18-20 and 37-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-17,21-36 and 42-45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Objections

Claims 3-17, 21-36 and claims 43-45 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependant claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McGahan. McGahan teaches a needle guide (figure 1, reference 18) having two removable parts (figure 1, references 22a, 22b and 26a and 26b), which are shaped to form complementary parts (column 3, lines 25-60), and the two part are connected to form an elongated guide hole (figure 1, reference 20 and claims 1-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGahan alone or in view of Filley et al. McGahan teaches a needle guide (figure 1, reference 18) having two removable parts (figure 1, references 22a, 22b and 26a and 26b), which are shaped to form complementary parts (column 3, lines 25-60), and the two part are connected to form an elongated guide hole (figure 1, reference 20 and claims 1-10). However, McGahan does not clearly teach having holes for guiding the

Art Unit: 3737

needle having multiple axis's. Filley et al., asserts a needle-guide device being adjustable so that the needle can be inserted at different angles (figure 1, references A and B). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the multi-axis system of Filley et al., with the needle-guide of McGahan in order to accurately adjust and clean a needle – guide.

Claims 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGahan alone or in view of Park et al. McGahan teaches a needle guide (figure 1, reference 18) having two removable parts (figure 1, references 22a, 22b and 26a and 26b), which are shaped to form complementary parts (column 3, lines 25-60), and the two part are connected to form an elongated guide hole (figure 1, reference 20 and claims 1-10). However, McGahan does not clearly teach having a mutual interlock engagement means and a clamping means. Park et al., teaches an interlocking means and a clamping means for the probe and needle-guide (claim 1 and column 2, line 12-35). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the clamping system of Park et al., with the needle-guide system of McGahan in order to accurately guide diagnostic and therapeutic tools.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wedel et al., discloses a needle-guide system for use with ultrasound.

Bollinger teaches a two-part needle guide system.

Miller teaches a two-part needle guide system for use with ultrasound transducers.


Zurinski et al., teaches a ultrasound applicator for biopsy.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maulin Patel whose telephone number is 703-305-6933. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marvin Lateef can be reached on 703-308-3256. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-0758.



Maulin Patel
February 7, 2003



Francis J. Jaworski
Primary Examiner